Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/758,702	WEBB ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Shane Bomar	3672
All Participants:	rticipants: Status of Application: Allowed	
(1) <u>Shane Bomar</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Anthony Rahhal</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>13 October 2005</u>	Time: <u>12pm</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applican	oplicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: None		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed: None		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE G	ENERAL NATURE OF WHA	T WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.	•	
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separ directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separ did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sun 	 The examiner will provide a rate record of the substance 	a written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
		•
/		
	•	
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	licant/Applicant's Representa	tive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Attorney Rahhal was contacted in response to the amendment filed on October 3, 2005, wherein claims 1, 7, and 12 were amended. The Examiner felt that more terminology needed to be added to amended claim 12 because the claimed restriction could technically read on the bottom of a borehole. Therefore, it was agreed to add the same limitations following the last recitation of "cementing plug" in claim 1 to the end of claim 12 via an Examiner's amendment.